arXiv:cond-mat/0203469v1 [cond-mat.dis-nn] 22 Mar 2002

Corrections to Scaling in the Droplet Picture of Spin Glasses

M.A.Moore

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Manchester, Manchester, M13 9PL, United Kingdom

(Dated: February 1, 2008)

The energy of a droplet of linear extent l in the "droplet theory" of spin glasses goes as l^{θ} for large l. It is argued that this formula needs to be modified by the addition of a scaling correction $l^{-\omega}$ in order to accurately describe droplet energies at the length scales currently probed in numerical simulations. With this simple modification all equilibrium numerical data on Ising spin glasses in two, three and four dimensions becomes compatible with the droplet model.

PACS numbers: 75.50.Lk, 02.60.Pn, 75.40Mg, 75.10.Nr

The controversy as to the nature of the ordered state of spin glasses still remains to be resolved. There are two theories: the "droplet theory" [1, 2, 3] and the replica symmetry breaking (RSB) theory of Parisi [4, 5]. Many numerical studies have been done in an attempt to resolve the controversy with results which are often uncomfortable for proponents of both theories. The most natural summary of the current numerical situation is the TNT (*trivial, non-trivial*) picture of Refs. [6, 7]. On this picture, which we shall explain in more detail below, the Parisi spin overlap function $P(q, L)$ for a system of linear dimension L seems to behave as expected from the RSB theory i.e. in a *non-trivial* fashion, while the behavior of the link overlap seems to be more in accordance with droplet model ideas as its variance seems to be tending to zero as L increases to infinity (which is regarded as *trivial*). In this paper we shall show that a simple and natural correction to scaling term added to the usual droplet energy expression can explain the origin of the TNT picture.

In the RSB theory there are low-energy excitations in which a finite fraction of the spins in the system are reversed but which only cost a finite amount of energy in the thermodynamic limit. The surface of these excitations is space-filling so that the fractal dimension of their surface d_s is the same as the space dimension d [8]. In the droplet theory, the lowest energy excitations of linear spatial extent l typically costs of order l^{θ}, where θ is a positive exponent, of order 0.20 in three dimensions [9] and 0.70 in four dimensions [10] according to studies of the energy to create a domain wall right across the system. Thus in the thermodynamic limit the excitations which flip a finite fraction of the spins cost an infinite amount of energy and also the surface of these excitations is not space filling, as $d_s < d$.

The Hamiltonian which is usually studied in numerical work is the Ising spin glass model:

$$\mathcal{H} = -\sum_{<i,j>} J_{ij} S_i S_j, \tag{1}$$

where the sites i lie on the sites of a cubic lattice with $N = L^d$ sites, $S_i = \pm 1$, the J_{ij} have a Gaussian distribution of zero mean and unit variance and couple nearest-neighbor sites on the lattice. Typically for equilibrium studies at low temperatures (done at temperatures T much less than the critical temperature T_c in order to diminish the complications from critical point effects [11]), $L \leq 14$ for 3D and $L \leq 5$ for 4D. By studying two real replicas of the system, with spins S_i and $S_i^{'}$ one can derive the Parisi spin overlap function $P(q, L)$, where

$$q = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i S_i S_i^{'} \tag{2}$$

and study the properties of link overlaps

$$q_l = \frac{1}{N_b} \sum_{<ij>} S_i S_j S_i^{'} S_j^{'}, \tag{3}$$

where N_b is the number of mearest-neighbor bonds on the lattice. On the droplet picture $P(q, L)$ should tend as $L \to \infty$ to a delta function at $q = q_{EA}$, and $P(q, L) \sim T/L^{\theta^{'}}$ for all $q \neq q_{EA}$ where the expectation is that $\theta^{'} = \theta$. In fact it is found that $\theta^{'} \approx 0$ and that $P(q, L)$ looks very similar to what is predicted from the mean-field RSB picture [8] in that $P(q, L) \neq 0$ for all $q \neq q_{EA}$ It is this result which advocates of the droplet model have found hardest to understand.

Studies of link overlaps are more in accordance with droplet model expectations. Their variance is predicted on the droplet model to decrease with L as T/L^{μ_l} with $\mu_l = 2(d - d_s) + \theta^{'}$ [12]. The most recent investigations of link overlaps have been performed by adding a bulk perturbation $-\epsilon q_l$ to $\mathcal{H}$ and studying its effect in the ground state (see below). Using this method Palassini and Young [7] report that in 3D $d_s = 2.58 \pm 0.02$ and $\theta^{'} = 0.02 \pm 0.03$ while in 4D $d_s = 3.77 \pm 0.05$ and $\theta^{'} = 0.03 \pm 0.05$. The droplet model expectation is again that $\theta^{'} = \theta$, which is clearly not satisfied at the L values which can be currently studied. On the RSB picture the variance of q_l should be non-zero for large L, which is not in accord with the results of [7]. (However, Marinari and Parisi [13] did obtain a finite variance of the link overlap in the large L limit by extrapolating it in an ad hoc way as $1/L$).

Thus if one accepts the TNT version of the numerical results but believes in the droplet model, the task is to understand why $\theta^{'} \neq \theta$ at least at the small values of L which can be currently reached in equilibrium numerical studies. We will assume that the droplet picture is essentially correct and explain why corrections to scaling result in θ' appearing to be close to zero for small L values.

It is important to realise what the low-energy excitations look like in spin glasses. Consider a domain wall crossing a system $M \times M \times L$. The energy cost of this domain on the droplet picture will be of order M^{θ} and the domain wall will be fractal with dimension d_s and with an area of order M^{d_s}. In three or more dimensions the interface may have holes throught it. Because it is fractal the extent of this wandering is of order M. The wandering of the interface by an amount of order M affects the determination of θ, see Ref. [14], where it was found that the best results were obtained when $L \gg M$ as then the interface is not affected by its interactions with the ends of the system. Suppose now we have two domain walls across the system. Then if their separation is large compared to M they will be unaffected by the presence of the other. However, if they are closer together then they interfere with each other and their overall energy will be greater than if the other one were absent. In other words, domain walls effectively repel each other. If they have a separation of order l, then the repulsive energy between them would be expected to vary with their separation as a power law, $l^{-\omega^{'}}$. No investigations of $\omega^{'}$ seem to exist in the literature.

Consider now a droplet of linear extent l. It too will have a fractal surface described by d_s. Pictures of large droplets have now appeared [6], and a systematic investigation of them is in [15]. Their fractal nature ensures that in three or more dimensions that they have holes through them, giving them a sponge-like appearance. However, because the surface of the droplet may wander by a distance of order l the energy of the droplet E will be modified by its wandering and "collisions" with itself to a form which we suppose by analogy with the above is

$$E = Al^{\theta} + Bl^{-\omega}. \tag{4}$$

The term $Bl^{-\omega}$ is a scaling correction to the form of the droplet energy at large l and A and B are positive constants. We shall argue that with this scaling correction it is possible to understand the TNT description of the numerical scene. The exponent ω is only well-defined as a correction to scaling exponent when $l \to \infty$, but we shall assume that Eq. (4) has utility outside this limit. We do not know whether $\omega^{'} = \omega$, but fortunately there already exists numerical data on the value of ω in 3D from the work of Lamarcq et al. [16].

These authors first computed the ground state for both $N = 6^3$ and $N = 10^3$. They then chose an arbitrary reference spin and flipped it along with a cluster containing $v - 1$ other spins connected to it. They next minimized the energy of this cluster by exchange Monte Carlo, but with the constraint that the reference spin is held fixed and the cluster was always connected and of size v. They found the largest extension (mean end-to-end distance) l of the cluster and found that for $v \leq 33$ its energy $E(l)$ varied as $l^{-\omega}$, where the exponent ω was 0.13 ± 0.02. For larger v values they found that $E(l)$ was increasing rather than decreasing with l but they were unsure whether this might not be an artifact of insufficient numbers of Monte Carlo steps. Note that according to Eq. (4), when both θ and ω are small $E(l)$ will have a shallow minimum. The clusters generated by their procedure were not compact (that is, $v \sim l^d$), but on the droplet picture, which is a scaling picture associated with the zero-temperature fixed point [1, 2] it is only required that large clusters be compact.

Eq. (4) is more illuminating when expressed in variables associated with its minimum at $l = l_0$:

$$E(l) = C\left(\frac{(l/l_0)^{\theta}}{\theta} + \frac{(l_0/l)^{\omega}}{\omega}\right), \tag{5}$$

where C is a positive constant. The position of the minimum is essentially unknown but there is a hint from the upturn in $E(l)$ seen in Ref. [16] that l_0 might lie between 7 and 10 lattice spacings in 3D. Then because the values of both θ and ω are small there is only a weak dependence of $E(l)$ on l in the region accessible to numerical studies (say 14 lattice spacings). The minimum is very shallow so that the apparent value of θ, which is $\theta^{'}$, will be close to zero. For example, the ratio $E(14)/E(7) = 1.006$ if l_0 is 7, whereas in the absence of the correction to scaling term this ratio is 1.15. In 4D the values of ω and l_0 are undetermined at present, but provided l_0 happens to lie in the region open to numerically studies, then again $\theta^{'}$ would be small.

While it is inevitable that exponents in 4D will be difficult to determine in numerical studies this is not so for 2D. There seems to be indirect evidence which supports an $E(l)$ as in Eq. (4) also for 2D systems. In two dimensions θ is very accurately determined as systems of 480^2 can be studied [17]. The exponent associated with a single domain wall, that is θ, is $-0.282(2)$ [14, 17]. However, studies where, say, θ is determined from the effects of thermally excited droplets (such as Monte Carlo simulations of the spin-glass susceptibility) yield an apparent $\theta^{'}$ close to -0.47 [18]. This discrepancy has long been a puzzle, and has prompted suggestions that perhaps different exponents describe domain wall energies and droplet energies [18]. However, Eq. (4) with $\omega \approx 0.47$ would seem to offer another way of resolving the descrepancy. For small values of l, droplets would apparently have energies decreasing as $l^{-\omega}$ as their energies are dominated by the correction to scaling term, but at large values of l the decrease with l will be slower and be as $l^{-|\theta|}$, as expected from the conventional droplet approach.

This crossover between the large and small l dependencies can be seen in the work of Middleton [19]. He studied link overlaps as in [7] and [13], by comparing the unperturbed J_{ij} ground state, $\{S_i^0\}$, with the ϵ-perturbed state, where $J_{ij} \to J_{ij} - \epsilon S_i^0 S_j^0/N_b$. The fraction of link values $S_i S_j$ on nearest-neighbor bonds $< ij >$ which are changed by the perturbation is $(1 - q_l)$. On the droplet model the sample average of this, $\overline{1 - q_l}$, is predicted to decrease as ϵ/L^{μ_l}. Using the values $\theta = -0.28$ and $d_s = 1.27$, $\mu_l \approx 1.18$, but with $\theta^{'}$ at its small l value of -0.47 the expected value of $\mu_l \approx 0.99$. Middleton studied the effective value of μ_l at length scale L using the definition

$$\mu_l^{\text{eff}} = -\frac{d[\ln(\overline{1 - q_l})]}{d\ln(L)}. \tag{6}$$

At $L = 16$ μ_l^{eff} was found to be 0.99 and increased to the large l expected value 1.18 when $L \sim 200$. In other words, μ_l^{eff} seems to interpolate beteen the two limits as expected on the basis of our correction to scaling.

Middleton himself attributed this gradual evolution of μ_l^{eff} with L to finite size corrections which can arise when studying quantities which have contributions from droplets of all sizes up to the system size L. The domain wall energy exponent θ is free of this problem as by definition domain walls only exist on the scale L. He showed that even if $E(l)$ varies just as l^θ for all l, then the contributions of droplets on all length scales up to L means that μ_l^{eff} approaches its asymptotic value only as $1/L^{d-\mu_l}$. These scale averaging corrections decrease in 2D with the exponent $d - \mu_l \approx 0.82$ and are therefore unlikely to be important when $L \sim 100$. In three dimensions $d - \mu_l \approx 1.3$. As in 3D only modest values of L can be studied the scale averaging corrections may there be a significant effect.

The effect of the correction to scaling in the formula for the droplet energy will have relevance beyond the confines of numerical simulations. The droplet model provides scaling laws for time-dependent quantities such as dynamical susceptibilities in terms of a length scale $L(t)$ which increases in a logarithmic manner with time t due to thermal activation of droplets on the length scale $L(t)$. In practice the length scale which can be explored in real experiments is rather limited (typically more than 10 lattice spacings but probably less than 200 [20]). The fact that this length scale is not very large means that corrections to asymptotic formula will be important and that will include the correction to the scaling energy proposed in this paper.

To summarize: there exists a simple correction to the usual scaling formula for the energy of a droplet which is consistent with the TNT summary of the numerical data on spin glasses. It would be useful to have direct studies of the two correction to scaling exponents exponents ω and $\omega^{'}$. In 3D and 4D, information on the value of l at the minimum of $E(l)$, l_0, is needed. As perhaps l_0 might have been already seen in the 3D work of Ref. [16], a precise determination could be possible with a little extra effort. In 2D an accurate determination of both exponents might be achievable with the techniques used in Refs. [17] and [19].

I would like to thank Alan Bray for many discussions.

[1] W. L. McMillan, J. Phys. C **17**, 3179 (1984).

[2] A. J. Bray and M. A. Moore, in *Glassy Dynamics and Optimization*, edited by J. L. van Hemmen and I. Morgenstern, (Springer, Berlin, 1986).

[3] D. S. Fisher and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 1601 (1986); Phys. Rev. B **38**, 386 (1988).

[4] G. Parisi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 1754 (1979); J. Phys. A **13**, 1101 (1980); Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1946 (1983).

[5] M. Mézard, G. Parisi and M. A. Virasoro, *Spin Glass Theory and Beyond* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1987).

[6] F. Krzakala and O. C. Martin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3013 (2000).

[7] M. Palassini and A. P. Young, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3017 (2000).

[8] E. Marinari, G. Parisi, F. Ricci-Tersenghi, J. Ruiz-Lorenzo and F. Zuliani, J. Stat. Phys. **98**, 973 (2000).

[9] A. J. Bray and M. A. Moore, J. Phys. C **17**, L463 (1984); W. L. McMillan, Phys. Rev. B **30**, 476 (1984); A. K. Hartmann, Phys. Rev. E **59**, 84 (1999).

[10] A. K. Hartmann, Phys. Rev. E **60**, 5135 (1999); K. Hukushima, Phys. Rev. E **60**, 3606 (1999).

[11] M. A. Moore, H. Bokil, and B. Drossel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 4252 (1998).

[12] B. Drossel, H. Bokil, M. A. Moore and A. J. Bray, Eur. Phys. J. B **13**, 369 (2000).

[13] E. Marinari and G. Parisi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3887 (2001).

[14] A. C. Carter, A. J. Bray and M. A. Moore, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 077201 (2002).

[15] J. Houdayer, F. Krzakala, and O. C. Martin, Eur. Phys. J. B **18**, 467 (2000).

[16] J. Lamarcq, J.-P. Bouchaud, O. C. Martin and M. Mézard, EuroPhysics Lett. in press. cond-mat/0107544.

[17] A. K. Hartmann and A. P. Young, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 180404 (2001).

[18] A very extensive review of the 2D spin glass problem has been given by N. Kawashima and T. Aoki, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn., **69**, Suppl. A, 169 (2000).

[19] A. A. Middleton Phys. Rev. B **63**, 060202 (2001).

[20] P. E. Jönsson, H. Yoshino and P. Nordblad, cond-mat /0203444.